

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/756,778	Applicant(s) GUEGUEN, ARNAUD	
	Examiner Joseph D. Torres	Art Unit 2133	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph D. Torres. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 March 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moher; Michael I. US 6161209 A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the use of the alternative form in claim 1 and removal by using language of claim 11.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

JOSEPH TORRES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Docket No: 201587US-2

Applicant Initiated Interview Request FormApplication No.: 09/756,778 First Named Applicant: GUEGUENExaminer: Joseph Torres Art Unit: 2133 Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection**Tentative Participants:**(1) Mr. Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr. (Reg. No. 40,440) (2) Examiner Torres

(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: March 8, 2006Proposed Time: 2 p.m.(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/Flg. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej. under 102(e)</u>	<u>Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-22, and 24</u>	<u>Moher (US 6,161,209)</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rej. under 103(a)</u>	<u>17 and 25</u>	<u>Moher in view of Hladik (US 5,734,962)</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

(1) That the "Estimated data b(i)," noted as to the outputs from soft-output decoding Means 1-K of Moher cannot be first urged to be "statistical data" and then urged to be "weighted information indicating a most likely value" Also, as the FIG. 8 "Estimated Data b(i)" that is fed back is being interpreted to be "information indicating a most likely value"

(continued on continuation sheet)

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM CONTINUATION SHEET

and being urged to be readable as the Claim 1 required "set of weighted output information," it is not believed to be reasonable to also interpret this "information indicating a most likely value" to be the Claim 1 required "decoded characteristic statistical quantity." The FIG. 8 "Means for estimating reliability" simply provides preliminary estimates as to codeword bits being either "0" or "1" based on the "Interference Model" and the feedback of "Estimated data $b(i)$." The apparent position that the reliability estimates as to codeword bits being either of a "0" or "1" value as reading as the "decoded information quality parameter" is not understood.

The observation at page 4 of the outstanding Action that "determined decoded information quality parameter $p(bk(i)=1|y)/p(bk(i)=0|y)$ in Figure 3 of Moher is a numerical scalar representing a probable errors existing in a set of decoded information items; Note: determined decoded information quality parameter $(bk(i)=1|y)Pr(bk(i)=0|y)$ is an indication of probable errors existing in a set of decoded information items due to interference" is not seen to be relevant to the Claim 1 requirement that "a probable number of errors existing in a set of decoded information items" must be represented, not just that errors were present that require estimating if bits are representative of a "0" or "1" value.

Also, to the extent that equation 2 in col. 12 of Moher is concerned with $Pr(s(t)|w)$, it is relative to "the M-vector of state probabilities at time t " (see col. 12, line 55) and is not a teaching that $Pr(s(t)|w)$ is a "determined decoded information quality parameter" as is simply assumed without explanation. The states of concern to Moher are "0" and "1," not the "probable number of errors existing in a set of decoded information items."

Claim 18 recites that there must be "N-bit decoding sequences" and that a sequence of binary information items is to contain "N symbols." The rejection simply asserts " $N=K$ in Figures 1 and 2 of Moher. This assertion is not understood as col. 10 of Moher clearly defines "K" to be the number of simultaneous users of a multiple access channel, not a teaching that "each received information item is processed by means of N-bit decoding sequences," or that any sequence of binary information items has "N symbols."

With regard to Claim 19, the sequence (b_1, \dots, b_K) of Moher being relied on simply represents estimated codeword bits for each of the users 1-K, not any "sequence of binary information items representing a fraction of a decoding sequence" as the claim requires.

With respect to Claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 24 (that depend from Claim 1), the rationale offered as to the subject matter in common with Claim 1 being met by FIG. 8 is either somehow replaced by new reliance on FIG. 21 (and $\Lambda_1(x)$ and $\Lambda_2(x)$ related thereto) or to an unexplained merger of FIG. 8 with FIG. 21.

With regard to Claim 6, this claim recites that “the determined decoded characteristic statistical quantity is a mean of an absolute value of extrinsic information determined from the set of extrinsic information items,” not that it is “substantially” a mean.

With regard to the 103 rejection, Claim 17 requires that “the determining of the decoded information quality parameter uses a predetermined reference table to select a decoded information quality parameter as a function of one or more configuration parameters and one or more determined decoded characteristic statistical quantities.” Claim 25 adds the requirement that “there are a plurality of the configuration parameters and a plurality of the determined decoded characteristic statistical quantities.” This claimed subject matter is not taught or suggested by either Moher or Hladik.